IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.K.DENESAN

TUESDAY, THE 20TH MARCH 2007 / 29TH PHALGUNA 1928

RP.No. 309 of 2007(D)

AGAINST THE JUDGEMENT IN OP.21241/2001 Dated 19/02/2007

.....

REVIEW PETITIONER/PETITIONER

V.L.PRADEEP KUMAR,VISHNUKRIPA,
MAITHANAM,VARKALA,THIRUVANANTHAPURAM DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI.ELVIN PETER P.J.
SRI.S.RAMESH

RESPONDENTS: RESPONDENTS/RESPONDENTS

---

1. STATE OF KERALA REPRESENTD BY THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT,THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

2. THE CHAIRMAN,KERALA STATE COCONUT DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD.,'KAILAS', T.C 4/1325,KOWDIAR,THIRUVANANTHAPRUAM-3.

3. THE MANAGING DIRECTOR,KERALA STATE COCONUT DEVELOPMENT CORPRATION LTD.,'KAILAS', T.C 4/1325,KOWDIAR,THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-3.

R1 BY GOVT. PLEADER SHRI. BIJOY CHANDRAN
R2 & 3 BY SC SMT. SUNITHA VINOD

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 20/03/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

K.K. DENESAN, J.

= = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =
R.P. No. 309 OF 2007 IN
O.P. No.21241 OF 2001 D
= = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =

Dated this the 20th March, 2007

O R D E R

This petition for review has been filed by the petitioner in O.P. No. 21241 of 2001. The review petitioner feels aggrieved by the statement in the judgment that he had made a request for retirement under the Voluntary Retirement Scheme (VRS). Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner had not made such a request and therefore it may not appear that the petitioner had put forward a case before this Court based on the statement that he had requested for retirement under V.R.S.

2. I have heard Govt. Pleader for the 1st respondent and Standing Counsel for respondents 2 and 3.

3. Since the petitioner feels that the statement contained in paragraph 2 of the judgment is likely to be understood as an admission made by the petitioner that he had made a request for retirement under V.R.S. and since it is seen that no such admission had in fact

been made by the petitioner, it is only appropriate in the interest of justice to make it clear that the statements contained in paragraph 2 of the judgment shall not be understood as an admission made by the petitioner that he had made a request for retirement under V.R.S. No other directions or observations are necessary. Review petition is disposed of as above.

K.K. DENESAN
JUDGE

jan/